

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6 and 17 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1 and 3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 56-20927 (JP'927) in view of Burrell et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,680,192). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended to call for an oblique portion that slants obliquely from the first linear portion from a boundary between the first linear portion and the oblique portion, wherein the boundary is at a position that overlaps with the seal member as viewed in plan. This amendment is supported at lines 2-8 of page 25. This amendment is also supported, for example, in Figs. 2 and 5. That is, as shown in Fig. 2, the seal material 30 extends substantially linearly (left and right) following the front edges of the substrates 10 and 20 where the first terminal 60 overlaps the second terminal 70. Further, as disclosed in lines 2-8 of page 25, a conductive material is mixed in the seal material 20, and the seal material 20 is formed in the area where the first terminal 60 and second terminal 70 overlap to enhance electrical conductivity between the terminals. Fig. 5 shows the conductive area between the substrates extending left and right following the front edge of the substrates 10 and 20.

When the seal material 20 is extended linearly, as shown in Fig. 2, beyond the conductive area shown in Fig. 5, the seal material 20 will overlap the boundary between

the linear portions 501 and the oblique portions 502. Neither JP '927 nor Burrell teach or suggest such a structure. That is, neither JP '927 nor Burrell teach or suggest an oblique portion that slants obliquely from the first linear portion from a boundary between the first linear portion and the oblique portion, wherein the boundary is at a position that overlaps with the seal member as viewed in plan. Since neither JP '927 nor Burrell teach or suggest such a structure, claim 1 and each corresponding dependent claim would not have been obvious.

Claims 4 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 56-20927 (JP'927) in view of Burrell et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,680,192) as applied to claims 1 and 3 above and further in view of Kobayashi (U.S. Patent No. 5,959,713) and JP 06-075240 A (JP'240).

Claim 4 has also been amended to call for an oblique portion that slants obliquely from the first linear portion from a boundary between the first linear portion and the oblique portion, wherein the boundary is at a position that overlaps with the seal member as viewed in plan. As stated above, this amendment is supported on page 25 of the application and, for example, Figures 2 and 5. As also stated above, neither JP '927 nor Burrell teach or suggest such a structure. Since neither JP '927 nor Burrell teach or suggest such a structure, it would not have been obvious to combine the teachings of JP '927, Burrell, and Kobayashi to arrive at the claimed invention.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

NEW CLAIM

New claim 17 has been added. This claim is supported throughout the specification and drawings as originally filed. No new matter has been added. Claim 17 calls for the liquid crystal display apparatus as claimed in claim 1, wherein the first input terminals extend in a direction from the first edge, the conductive material extends in a direction substantially perpendicular to the direction in which the first input terminals extend, and the boundary between the first linear portion and the oblique portion is located lateral to the conductive material in the direction in which the conductive material extends. This claim clarifies that the boundary between the first linear portion and the oblique portion is located lateral to the conductive area in the direction in which the conductive area extends. Favorable consideration of this new claim is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 21, 2004

By: G. Gregory Schivley

G. Gregory Schivley, Reg. No. 27,382

Bryant E. Wade, Reg. No. 40,344

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

GGG/BEW/JAH